31st January 1936]

Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER:—"May I ask whether this information could not be collected from the records available with the Government?"

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"The existing establishment has been fixed as the normal schedule of establishment. There have been occasional changes and therefore it would not be possible to readily collect this information."

Settlement of the pension and provident fund accounts of the ex-taluk board clerks.

* 658 *Q.*—Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the pension accounts of the ex-taluk board clerks have been settled and they have been put on the provident fund scheme; and

(*b*) if so, from which date and whether a copy of the order passed in the matter will be placed on the table?

A.—The attention of the hon. Member is drawn to G.O. No. 1510, L. & M., dated the 15th April 1935, a copy of which has already been laid on the table of the House [vide question No. 60 (starred) answered on the 6th August 1935], and to G.O. No. 4099, L. & M., dated the 7th October 1935, a copy [a] of which is now laid on the table of the House. With reference to these orders the pension papers of the pensionable employees of late taluk boards are being forwarded by the presidents of district boards concerned to the Accountant-General for scrutiny and audit certificate.

Modification of the scale of pay of pandits employed in schools under district boards and municipalities.

* 659 *Q.*—Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether orders have been passed modifying the scale of pay of pandits employed in the schools under the district boards and municipalities;

(*b*) if so, whether a copy of it will be placed on the table;

(*c*) whether the matter of regulating the pay of pandits who are not holders of titles or proficiency certificates but who have been exempted in G.O. No. 1064, dated 12th March 1927, has been considered;

(*d*) if so, what the scale of pay allowed to such pandits is;

(*e*) whether representations have been received from such pandits employed in the Municipal High School at Gudiyattam in North Arcot district; and

(*f*) if so, what orders have been passed thereon, and whether a copy of it will be placed on the table?

---

[a] Printed as Appendix IV on page 321 infra.

[31st January 1936

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) G.O. No. 3395, L. & M., dated the 20th August 1935, was placed on the table in reply to question No. 285 answered on 30th October 1935.

(c) & (d) The matter is under consideration.

(e) Yes.

(f) It is under consideration.

Mr. G. RAMESWARA RAO:—" May I know whether petitions were received from some of the pandits who had been appointed before 1926 complaining that they were unjustly treated as they were declared ineligible for the higher scale? "

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" No representations have been received."

Mr. G. RAMESWARA RAO:—" Is it not a fact that these pandits who have been doing their work well for over 20 years have been made ineligible for the present scale of pay on the ground that they have no titles? "

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" It is not a question of titles. The latest rules are that if they undergo a course of studies which is equivalent to that of a graduate, the remuneration should be commensurate with that qualification. In view of these considerations, the Government have decided to raise the scale of pay of those who fulfil the qualifications fixed under the latest orders."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I ask whether the Government will not reconsider their orders in view of the hardship caused to the employees? "

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" There is absolutely no hardship caused."

Mr. P. PEDDI RAJU:—" Are the Government aware that there was a time when the Universities did not grant titles and there were no institutions giving training to the pandits? If so, do not the Government consider that these people deserve special consideration in view of their long service and all that? "

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" I do not see why they alone deserve special consideration. If that rule is to be extended, every employee would deserve special consideration."

Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER:—" How long the representations referred to in clause (e) have been pending disposal? "

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" Some representations were originally received and Government have passed orders on them. Further representations have since been received to extend the benefit to all pandits. I cannot give the exact date when they were received."

31st January 1936]

Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar :—" May I ask whether the Hon. the Minister is not aware that the literary equipment of some of the older pandits in service is in no way inferior to the equipment of the modern pandits having titles? "

The Hon. the Raja of Bobbili :—" I am not competent to speak on the merits of individual cases. But the question is that the old pandits are drawing their old scales of pay."

Constitution of a panchayat for Kodumudi, Coimbatore district.

* 660 Q.—Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether a panchayat has been constituted for Kodumudi in Coimbatore district;

(b) if so, when;

(c) if not, why the matter is kept pending and when it is likely to be constituted; and

(d) if it has been constituted, what the annual receipts and charges are of that panchayat as per budget estimates for the year 1935–36?

A.—(a) & (b) The Government understand that the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards has constituted a panchayat for Kodumudi in pursuance of his order, dated the 5th December 1934.

(c) Does not arise.

(d) No information is available.

Report of the Special Officer appointed to formulate proposals for road development.

* 661 Q.—Mr. M. S. Sreshta: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Special Engineer for Road Development, Mr. Vipan, has made his report regarding proposals for the construction of bridges and roads and improvements thereto;

(b) if so, what the proposals are in regard to each district and what the estimated cost is of the proposals for each district;

(c) whether it is a fact that it is proposed that the funds of the Road Development Board are to be used on roads which would not compete with railways;

(d) if so, whether the question of improving the trunk road from Mangalore northwards and bridging all the rivers has been considered;

(e) what amounts have been spent on trunk roads in each district of this Province during each of the last three years;

(f) whether it is a fact that the recommendations of the Special Engineer will be referred to the Road Board for their opinion;

(g) if so, who the members of the Road Board are; and

(h) what steps have been taken to represent the interests of South Kanara on this Board?